III. AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

None.

IV.   REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Subsequent to the subject Office Action, claims 1-3 are pending in the Application. Claims 1-3 stand rejected. Claim 2 has been amended. No new subject matter has been added to this application. Reconsideration of Claims 1-3 is requested.

Specification

The specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter, specifically the terms 'task stage', 'cross functional link', and 'action state' were not explained or used in the specification but are present in the limitation of claim 2. Claim 2 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter as supported in the specification, particularly in Para. 0031. Applicant requests withdrawal of this objection to the specification.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the inventor regards as the invention. It was stated that claim 2 sets forth limitations of 'task stage' and 'action stage' without providing a teaching or definition in the specification as to what they are. As previously stated, claim 2 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of newly amended claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Jacober*, et al. (USPN 6,020,886). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the anticipation rejections levied against claims 1-3 in the subject Office Action in view of the arguments, remarks and amendments made to the claims as set forth herein.

It is well settled that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." ***W.L. Gore & Assocs. v. Garlock, Inc.***, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983), ***cert. denied***, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). And, "[a]bsence from the reference of any claimed element negates anticipation." ***Row v. Dror***, 42 USPQ 2d 1550, 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (quoting ***Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible, Inc.***, 230 USPQ 81, 84 (Fed. Cir. 1986)). Each and every element of the claimed invention furthermore must be arranged as in the claim. ***Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.***, 730 F.2d 1452, 1458 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. ***Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.***, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicant traverses any rejection of claims 1, 2, and 3 in view of *Jacober* because *Jacober* fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the arranged as in the claims, as is required under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Specifically, *Jacober* fails to teach or describe a process learning aid as set forth in each of claims 1, 2, and 3, comprising, inter alia, integrating a business process and related training from which the business process is supported and tasks are completed including a model of the business process wherein the business process includes stages defined by a series of roles and tasks linked to an application system being used to carry out the business process wherein the business process

defines the progression of information by the series of roles and tasks linked to the

application system being used to carry out the business process.

Applicant's claims are patentably distinguishable from *Jacober* at least in that

Jacober merely teaches a help demonstration player program that accepts a set of commands

in the form of a script input and generates simulated keystrokes and mouse events. The

simulated keystrokes and mouse events are provided to the application program which then

operates as if the user had generated the keystrokes and mouse events. The sequence of

keystrokes and mouse events directs the application software to perform a task one step at a

time. The task starts with a user's customized screen, and the demonstration player can detect

and respond to the customized state of the user's screen (Col. 2, Line 63 – Col. 3, Line 6).

Furthermore, Fig. 2 illustrates how the demonstration player program 200 operates by

controlling an application program 208 in the same manner that a user would control the

program (Col. 5, Lines 27-31). Thus, *Jacober* provides no integrating of a business process

and related training from which the business process is supported and tasks are completed, as

set forth in applicant's claims.

Fig. 6 of *Jacober* includes a flowchart illustrating the steps involved in generating an

animated held demonstration, which includes loading a sample data file, which is used to

prevent the demonstration player from corrupting the user's actual data (Col. 7, Lines 54-63).

Jacober is clearly merely concerned with a simulated environment wherein it is not possible

to actually complete tasks of the business process. Thus *Jacober* fails to teach or suggest

integrating a business process and related training from which the business process is

supported and tasks are completed, as set forth in the instant invention.

The Office Action cites Fig. 7, and Col. 11, Lines 35-47, and Col 12, Lines 46-61 of

Jacober to anticipate a task stage and an action stage. Through these elements, however,

Jacober merely describes working within the demonstration player program, and in no way teaches or suggests integrating a business process and related training from which the business process is supported and tasks are completed, as set forth in applicant's claims.

For at least these reasons, Claims 1-3 are patentably distinguishable over *Jacober*, and therefore allowable.

Conclusion

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-3 are in condition for allowance and applicant requests that same be allowed to proceed to issue.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the phone number appearing below if any questions remain subsequent to considering this response.

Any fees associated with this response may be charged to General Motors Deposit Account No. 07-0960.

Respectfully submitted,

/Vincent A. Cichosz, Reg No. 35,844/
Vincent A. Cichosz
for
CICHOSZ AND CICHOSZ PLLC
129 East Commerce St.
Milford, MI 48381
(248) 676-2798
Attorneys for Applicant